

Provide a map of the project area showing all wells. Highlight and label the locations of all wells which:

1. have experienced purges of CO₂ or water, indicating volumes lost if known (include wells in Kay County which have purged).
2. have been plugged as part of the project
3. extend to the Arbuckle or below to the granite
4. in addition, indicate the formation pressures (contoured if possible, or at least labeled)
5. volumes purged, pressures, or other relevant data can be tabulated separately if necessary

Provide, for the wells which have experienced purges, a copy of historical plugging records or other file information on the wells, including schematics, cement records, etc.

Provide for the purge events, a discussion of actions taken to control the purges, detailing the extent of area shut down to correct a purge event, i.e., are other nearby injectors shut in, is production curtailed, and what are the effects on formation pressures during an event. If Chaparral has a written protocol, please provide it.

Discussion questions:

What commonalities does Chaparral see between all of the various purge events? (e.g., reaching a certain formation pressure, method of plugging, age of well, etc)

Does Chaparral see any correspondence between operational changes such as switching wells to water, gas, or other actions with the incidences of purging?

Why does Chaparral believe these wells which have purged were unable to contain the pressures in the project area?

Does Chaparral continue to believe the reliance on mud plugged wells is sufficient under current operational practices?

What operational practices can be modified to reduce these occurrences?

How can migration of pressure and/or CO₂ into the Arbuckle formation be assessed and, if necessary, mitigated?